Appendix to Better Federal Policies Leading to Better Schools by the Center on Education Policy

I. Studies That Informed CEP’s Principles and Recommendations

A. Papers Commissioned by CEP

CEP commissioned 11 papers for its project on rethinking the federal role in elementary and secondary education. These papers informed all of the principles and many of the recommendations presented in Better Federal Policies Leading to Better Schools. All of the commissioned papers were released in 2008 or 2009 and are available on CEP’s Web site at www.cep-dc.org.

CEP received advice on the topics to be explored in the papers, possible authors, and peer reviewers of the papers from an advisory group of three nationally known experts with different areas of expertise and political views: Linda Darling-Hammond, a professor of education at Stanford University and co-director of the School Redesign Network; Eric A. Hanushek, a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution; and Thomas W. Payzant, professor at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, former superintendent of the Boston Public Schools, and former assistant secretary for elementary and secondary education in the U.S. Department of Education. CEP was responsible for the final decision on topics, authors, and peer reviewers.

As general guidelines, we asked the authors of the papers to conduct a fact-based evaluation of past and present national education policies in a specific area; to determine the effects of these policies to the extent possible; to glean what can be learned from past experience to shape a more effective federal role in the future; and to consider new challenges and opportunities that have implications for a refashioned federal role.

Six of the papers were presented at public forums on Capitol Hill, sponsored by Republican and Democratic leaders of Congress, where they were critiqued and then revised accordingly.

The list of the commissioned papers and their authors follows:

*National efforts to bring reform to scale in America’s high-poverty elementary and secondary schools: Outcomes and implications*
  Geoffrey D. Borman, University of Wisconsin-Madison

*From PLATO to podcasts: Fifty years of federal involvement in educational technology*
  Mathew Cherian, Graduate Student, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

*Standards-based reform in the United States: History, research, and future directions*
  Laura S. Hamilton, Brian M. Stecher, & Kun Yuan, RAND Corporation
Demographic trends and the federal role in education
   Harold Hodgkinson, Hodgkinson Associates, Alexandria, VA

Advancing ECE policy: Early childhood education (ECE) and its quest for excellence, coherence, and equity (ECE)
   Sharon L. Kagan & Jeanne L. Reid, Teachers College, Columbia University

The federal role in education: Lessons from Australia, Germany, and Canada
   Chad R. Lykins & Stephen P. Heyneman, Vanderbilt University

Federal aid to elementary and secondary education: Premises, effects, and major lessons learned
   Paul Manna, College of William and Mary

The role of assessment in federal education programs
   W. James Popham, University of California, Los Angeles

What the federal government can do to improve high school performance
   Russell W. Rumberger, University of California, Santa Barbara

Fifty years of federal teacher policy: An appraisal
   Gary Sykes & Kenne Dibner, Michigan State University

The federal role in out-of-school learning: After-school, summer learning, and family involvement as critical learning supports

B. Compendium of NCLB Research

In addition to commissioning the papers above, CEP compiled a Compendium of Key Studies of the No Child Left Behind Act, which is available on CEP’s Web site at www.cep-dc.org. This compendium briefly summarizes the major research on the No Child Left Behind Act. The compendium includes research-based studies of significant policy issues that had been published since 2005; were national or regional in scope; were conducted using well-established research methods by scholars, government agencies, or organizations with expertise in NCLB; and were accessible on the Web.

Deciding which studies to include sometimes involved making judgment calls—determining, for example, what constitutes a significant policy issue. We tried to make these judgments in good faith without regard to our own views about the findings of the studies. A CEP senior consultant and two research interns reviewed the findings of the selected studies and developed summaries of each. Wayne Riddle and Joel Packer, two experts who have closely tracked NCLB research since the law's inception, reviewed the list of studies and the content of the summaries and suggested additions and revisions.
C. Studies That Informed CEP’s Recommendations

The reference list below shows the studies, in addition to the 11 commissioned papers, that support specific points raised in the discussion of principles and recommendations in Better Federal Policies Leading to Better Schools. Many, though not all, of these studies are contained in the NCLB research compendium described above.

Principles 1-5


Multiple recommendations


Center on Education Policy. (2005). *From the capital to the classroom: Year 3 of the No Child Left Behind Act*. Washington, DC: Author. [Recommendations 1, 4, 5, 8 & 9]
Center on Education Policy. (2006). *From the capital to the classroom: Year 4 of the No Child Left Behind Act*. Washington, DC: Author. [Recommendations 1, 5, 8 & 9]


Center on Education Policy. (2009). *State test score trends through 2007-08, part 1: Is the emphasis on "proficiency" shortchanging higher- and lower-achieving students?* Washington, DC: Author. [Recommendations 1 & 7]


**Recommendation 1  (Standards-based reform)**


Center on Education Policy. (2007). *Answering the question that matters most: Has student achievement increased since No Child Left Behind?* Washington, DC: Author.


**Recommendation 2  (Standards)**


**Recommendation 3**  *(Assessments)*


**Recommendation 4**  *(Systems for continuous improvement)*


Center on Education Policy. (2008). *Many states have taken a “backloaded” approach to NCLB’s goal of all students scoring “proficient.”* Washington, DC: Author.


**Recommendation 5** (Support to low-performing schools)


**Recommendation 6** *(Resource equity)*


**Recommendation 7**  
*(High school reform)*


**Recommendation 8**  
*(Students with disabilities and English language learners)*


**Recommendation 9** (Teacher quality)


Recommendation 10  (Complementary learning)


